



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,038	07/15/2003	Justin Shimek	6126US	7511
30173 7590 04/24/2007 GENERAL MILLS, INC. P.O. BOX 1113 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440			EXAMINER MAHAFKEY, KELLY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,038

Applicant(s)

SHIMEK ET AL.

Examiner

Kelly Mahafkey

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-39 and 81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-39 and 81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Amendments made 4/5/07 have been entered.

Claims 1, 3-39, and 81 remain pending.

Regarding the petition filed 4/5/07 to withdraw the finality of the office action mailed 2/22/07, it is noted that upon reconsideration, the finality of the office action has been withdrawn to allow for the introduction of new grounds of rejection as presented herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "major portion" in claim 9 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "major" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear as to what percentage or amount of a component must be included in a group in order to be "major" portion of that group.

Claim 21 recites, "the food product of claim 20 wherein the dried soft aerated food product is in the form of a topical coating". Claim 20 refers to claim 11 which recites, "the aerated food product of claim 10 in the form of shaped pieces...". It is unclear how a shaped piece can form a topical coating, and thus claim 21 conflicts with the claims from which it depends on. For examination purposes, the examiner will consider claim 21 as dependant upon claim 1.

Claim 22 recites, "the food product of claim 20 wherein the dried soft aerated food product is in the form of a filling". Claim 20 refers to claim 11 which recites, "the aerated food product of claim 10 in the form of shaped pieces...". It is unclear how a

Art Unit: 1761

shaped piece can form a filling, and thus claim 22 conflicts with the claims from which it depends on. For examination purposes, the examiner will consider claim 22 as dependant upon claim 1.

Claim 24 recites the "product [of claim 20]", however, there are two "products" recited in claim 20, both a "dried soft aerated food product" and a "composite food product". It is unclear as to which "product" the limitations of claim 24 refer.

Claim 27 recites, "the food product of claim 26 wherein the dried soft aerated food product is in the form of a peripheral border". Claim 26 recites, "the food product of claim 25 in the form of a wafer". It is unclear how a wafer can form a peripheral border, and thus claim 27 conflicts with the claim from which it depends on. For examination purposes, the examiner will consider claim 27 as dependant upon claim 1.

Claim 28 recites, "the food product of claim 25 wherein the dried soft aerated food product is in the form of a peripheral border". Claim 25 recites, "the food product of claim 17 in the form of a wafer". It is unclear how a wafer can form a peripheral border, and thus claim 28 conflicts with the claim from which it depends on. For examination purposes, the examiner will consider claim 28 as dependant upon claim 1.

Claim 30 recites, "the food product of claim 29", however, claim 29 refers to claim 22, which refers to claim 20, and there are two "products" recited in claim 20, both a "dried soft aerated food product" and a "composite food product". Thus it is unclear as to which "product" the limitations of claim 30 refer.

Claim 31 recites, "the food product of claim 30", however, claim 30 refers to claim 29, claim 29 refers to claim 22, claim 22 refers to claim 20, and there are two "products" recited in claim 20, both a "dried soft aerated food product" and a "composite food product". Thus it is unclear as to which "product" the limitations of claim 30 refer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1761

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-9, 14-17, 32, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Peterson (US 3620769).

Peterson teaches of an aerated confection comprising:

- 84-98% saccharide component, including sucrose and corn syrup, wherein a major portion of the saccharide component is sucrose;
- 0.5-10% of a thickener, including gelatin 250 Bloom (i.e. a protein based foaming and structuring agent);
- 0.25-14% fat;
- 6.4% glycerin (i.e. a softening agent);
- about 7% and about 10% moisture (Examples B, 2, and 3);
- color; and
- flavor;

Refer specifically to Column 2 lines 52-60 and Examples 1-3. Peterson teaches that the aerated confection is a portion of a composite food product, in which the aerated confection is a filling (Column 3 line 59 through Column 4 line 67). Peterson teaches that the density of the confection is 0.5g/cc or *about* 0.35g/cc. Note: Due to the optional limitation recited in claim 15, the inclusion of a nutritionally fortifying ingredient and/or a biologically active component, as recited in dependent claims 16 and 17 are not required limitations, and thus claims 16 and 17 are also included in the rejection.

Specifically regarding the glass transition temperature of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 5 and the spring back factor of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 32, it is noted that the claim 1 recites, "about 5-25% of a softening agent to provide a glass transition temperature... and a spring back factor..."

Art Unit: 1761

Since Peterson teaches of a similar confection with the instantly claimed softening agent within the instantly claimed range, it would be expected that Peterson inherently teaches of a product that has a glass transition temperature and spring back factor as instantly claimed.

Specifically regarding the aerated confection as "soft", as recited in claim 1, Peterson teaches of preventing the aerated confection from drying out and forming a dried marshmallow. Thus, Peterson inherently teaches of a marshmallow that is soft compared to undesirable "dried" marshmallow.

Specifically regarding the water activity of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 13, water activity is a measure of the water available to transfer within a product and thus a function of the ingredients within a product, particularly water and the humectants (i.e. such as glycerin). Since Peterson teaches of a similar product with amounts of water and humectants within the same range as instantly claimed by applicant, it would be expected that Peterson inherently teaches of an aerated confection that has the same water activity as instantly claimed.

Specifically regarding the compressibility and bulk compressibility of the aerated confection as recited in claims 7 and 81, bulk compressibility is based on product composition and method of making, specifically the degree of aeration. Since the composition as taught by Peterson is similar to the one as instantly claimed by applicant, and since both products were aerated to similar degrees, it would be expected that Peterson inherently teaches of a product that has the same compressibility and bulk compressibility as instantly claimed.

Applicant is reminded that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, it is noted that applicant has chosen to use an equation with parameters that cannot be

Art Unit: 1761

measured by the Office, for the purpose of prior art comparison, because the office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products and compare them for patentability. Therefore, the burden is shifted to the applicant to show that the prior art product is different.

Claims 1, 3-9, 14-17, 32, 38, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Roy et al (US 2004/0109933).

In Example 1, Roy teaches of an aerated confection comprising:

- About 79% saccharide component, including about 59% sucrose, about 11% corn syrup, and about 9% dextrose;
- About 2% gelatin (i.e. a protein based foaming and structuring agent);
- color; and
- flavor;

Roy teaches that the glycerin is substituted for dextrose, thus teaching of an aerated confection with 9% glycerin (i.e. a softening agent). Refer specifically to paragraph 0010. Roy teaches that the aerated confection comprises 1-5% moisture, preferably 2-3% moisture for marbits, or 10-30% moisture for marshmallows (paragraphs 0005 and 0006). Roy teaches that the aerated confection can be a marbit or a marshmallow with different flavors and/or colors (Paragraph 0004). Roy teaches that the density of the aerated confection as 0.17-0.48g/cc (Paragraph 0007). In Example 1, Roy teaches that the aerated composition contains less than 5% fat. Note: Due to the optional limitation recited in claim 15, the inclusion of a nutritionally fortifying ingredient and/or a biologically active component, as recited in dependent claims 16 and 17 are not required limitations, and thus claims 16 and 17 are also included in the rejection.

Specifically regarding the glass transition temperature of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 5 and the spring back factor of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 32, it is noted that the claim 1 recites, "about 5-25% of a softening agent to provide a glass transition temperature... and a spring back factor..."

Art Unit: 1761

Since Roy teaches of a similar confection with the instantly claimed softening agent within the instantly claimed range, it would be expected that Roy inherently teaches of a product that has a glass transition temperature and spring back factor as instantly claimed.

Specifically regarding the aerated confection as "soft", as recited in claim 1, Roy teaches of an aerated confection with a similar composition as instantly claimed. More specifically, Roy teaches of including an amount of a softening agent within the instantly claimed range, thus it would be expected that Roy inherently teaches of an aerated confection that has the same "softness" as instantly claimed.

Specifically regarding the water activity of the aerated confection as recited in claims 1 and 13, water activity is a measure of the water available to transfer within a product and thus a function of the ingredients within a product, particularly water and the humectants (i.e. such as glycerin). Since Roy teaches of a similar product with amounts of water and humectants within the same range as instantly claimed by applicant, it would be expected that Roy inherently teaches of an aerated confection that has the same water activity as instantly claimed.

Specifically regarding the compressibility and bulk compressibility of the aerated confection as recited in claims 7 and 81, bulk compressibility is based on product composition and method of making, specifically the degree of aeration. Since the composition as taught by Roy is similar to the one as instantly claimed by applicant, and since both products were aerated to similar degrees, it would be expected that Roy inherently teaches of a product that has the same compressibility and bulk compressibility as instantly claimed.

Applicant is reminded that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, it

Art Unit: 1761

is noted that applicant has chosen to use an equation with parameters that cannot be measured by the Office, for the purpose of prior art comparison, because the office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products and compare them for patentability. Therefore, the burden is shifted to the applicant to show that the prior art product is different.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The 103 rejection of claims 1-36, 38, and 79-81 over Zietlow (US 6207216) in view of Iggoe (Dictionary of Food Ingredients, 4th Edition) has been withdrawn in light of applicant's arguments made 4/5/07.

The 103 rejection of claims 37 and 39 over Zietlow (US 6207216) in view of Iggoe (Dictionary of Food Ingredients, 4th Edition), further in view of Gajewski (US 4251561) has been withdrawn in light of applicant's arguments made 4/5/07.

Claims 10-13, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27-31, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (US 2004/0109933), in view of Zietlow (US 6309686 B1).

Roy teaches of aerated confections, including marbits as discussed above. Roy teaches that marbits are cut into appropriate shapes and sizes (Paragraphs 0014 and 0016). Roy, however, is silent to what sizes are appropriate as recited in claims 10 and 11, and to how the marbits are consumed, including the marbit having a second portion of a second color as recited in claims 19 and 24, the marbit as part of a composite food product as recited in claim 20, the marbit as in the form of a filling or core as recited in claims 22 and 29, the marbit as in the form of a peripheral border as recited in claims 27 and 28, and the marbit as admixed with a dry particulate matter, including a RTE cereal as recited in claims 30, 31, and 36.

Art Unit: 1761

Zietlow teaches of aerated confections, including marbits. Zietlow teaches that marbits can be consumed as novelty confections or can be added to ready to eat breakfast cereals. Zietlow teaches that marbits are cut into pieces that weighing about 0.16-0.25 g. Refer specifically to Abstract and Column 1 lines 20-35. Zietlow teaches that an improved aerated confection, which is made up of two marbit phases. Zietlow teaches that the phases are of different colors and that one phases comprises the filling or core and the other phase comprises a peripheral border. Zietlow teaches that these confections are consumed with RTE cereals and are particularly marketed to children. Refer specifically to Column 1 line 20 through Column 3 line 31.

Specifically regarding an appropriate size for the marbit as recited in claims 10 and 11, since Roy teaches of cutting marbits to an appropriate size, but does not teach of specific size, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to the marbit art, such as Zietlow, for a known marbit size. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to cut the marbits as taught by Roy to a size weighing 0.16-0.25 g a piece.

Specifically regarding the marbit as consumed with an RTE cereal, as a composite food product, having a first marbit portion as filling or core and a second portion of a second color as a peripheral border, as recited in claims 19, 20, 22, 24, 17-31, and 36, Roy teaches of making marbits, but does not teach of how they are intended to be consumed, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to the marbit art, such as Zietlow, for a known method of consumption. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to package to marbit with an RTE cereal, as a composite food product, having a first marbit portion as filling or core and a second portion of a second color as a peripheral border in order to appeal to children. It is noted that to modify the form of the marbit as taught by Roy would not provide a patentable distinction to the claims, as this was common in the art.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (US 2004/0109933), in view of Zietlow (US 6207216 B1).

Roy teaches of aerated confections with additional textures, tastes, flavors, and an enhanced nutritional composition, including marbits as discussed above. Roy, however, is silent to the marbits as including 0.1-5% calcium as recited in claim 18, to the aerated confection in the form of a topical coating as recited in claim 21, to the marbit as including at least one vitamin as recited in claim 23, in the form of a wafer with a thickness of about 1-5mm as recited in claims 25 and 26, and to the marbits as including 0.05-1% of a high intensity sweetener as recited in claims 33 and 35.

Zietlow teaches that marbits can be nutritionally enhanced with vitamins and 0.15-15% calcium (Column 4 lines 43-67 and Column 7 lines 58-61). Zietlow teaches that the marbits can include 1-10% high potency sweeteners to further enhance the organoleptic properties of the marbit (Column 4 lines 46-51). Zietlow teaches that the marbits can be in many forms, including as bars, with cereals, as topical coatings, as a wafer with a thickness of about 1 to 5 mm, ect (Column 5 lines 36-47, Column 7 lines 45-56, and Claims 18 and 19).

Specifically regarding the marbit as taught by Roy as including at least one vitamin and 0.15-5% calcium, Zietlow teaches that an aerated confection or marbit can be nutritionally enhanced with the addition of at least one vitamin and 0.15-15% calcium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include at least one vitamin and 0.15-15% calcium in the marbit composition as taught by Roy in order to further enhance the nutrition of the confection.

Specifically regarding the marbit as consumed as a topical coating or in the form of a wafer with a thickness of about 1-5mm as recited in claims 21, 25, and 26, Roy teaches of making marbits, but does not teach of how they are intended to be consumed, thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to the marbit art, such as Zietlow, for a known method of consumption. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to package the aerated confection as taught by Roy as a topical coating on a bar in order to enjoy the confection with products such as granola and peanut butter. One of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 1761

art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to package the aerated confection as taught by Roy as a wafer with a thickness of about 1 to 5 mm in order to easily consume the confection alone (i.e. without other confectionary supports). To modify the form of the marbit as taught by Roy would not provide a patentable distinction to the claims, as this was common in the art.

Specifically regarding the marbits as including 0.05-1% of a high intensity sweetener as recited in claims 33 and 35, Zietlow teaches that the addition of 1-10% of a high intensity sweetener improves the organoleptic properties of marbits. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to include 1-10% of a high intensity sweetener in the marbit composition as taught by Roy in order to improve the organoleptic properties of the confection.

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (US 2004/0109933), in view of Zietlow (US 6207216 B1), further in view of Igoe (Dictionary of Food Ingredients, 4th Edition).

Roy teaches of aerated confections, including marbits as discussed above. Roy, however, is silent, to the aerated confection as including a high intensity sweetener, such as sucralose as recited in claim 34. Zietlow teaches that the marbits can include 1-10% high potency sweeteners to further enhance the organoleptic properties of the marbit (Column 4 lines 46-51). As stated above, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to include 1-10% of a high potency sweetener, as taught by Zietlow, in order to enhance the organoleptic properties of the aerated confection taught by Roy. Zietlow, however, is silent to the type of high potency sweetener to use in the aerated confection.

Igoe teaches that sucralose is a high intensity sweetener which is commonly used in confectionary products. Igoe teaches that the sucralose has 0 calories and is 600 times as sweet as sugar with a similar flavor profile. Igoe teaches that it is heat stable, readily soluble, and maintains its stability at elevated temperatures. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include sucralose in the aerated confection as disclosed by Roy in view of Zietlow.

Art Unit: 1761

One would have been motivated to do so because of the benefits of sucralose, such as it would provide a lower-calorie sugar free product, it is 600 times as sweet as sugar with a similar flavor profile, heat stable, readily soluble, and maintains its stability at elevated temperatures.

Claims 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (US 2004/0109933), in view of Zietlow (US 6207216 B1) and Igoe (Dictionary of Food Ingredients, 4th Edition), further in view of Gajewski (US 4251561).

Roy teaches of aerated confections, including marbits as discussed above. Roy teaches that the marbits include gelatin with a bloom strength of 225. Roy, however, does not teach the gelatin with a bloom strength of at least 250.

Gajewski teaches an aerated confection comprising gelatin (see Abstract). Gajewski teaches that the bloom strength of the gelatin used should be between 150 and 300 with the best results being obtained between 250 and 300 (which would include the instantly claimed bloom of 250). Gajewski teaches that less gelatin is required when gelatins having high bloom strengths are employed. Refer specifically to Columns 4, lines 49-68 and Column 5, lines 1-18.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used gelatin with a bloom strength of 250 to 300 in the aerated confection as taught by Roy. One would have been motivated to do so in order to use fewer materials while still using a gelatin preferred for aerated confections.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly Mahafkey whose telephone number is (571) 272-2739. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8am-4:30pm.

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kelly Mahafkey
Examiner
Art Unit 1761



Steve Weinstein
STEVE WEINSTEIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER 1761
4/23/07
for K. Hendricks